

Serial No.: 10/065,285
Attorney Docket No.: F-560

Patent

REMARKS

1. Status of Claims

Claims 1-15 were pending in the Application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 9, 11 and 14 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-15 will remain pending in the application.

2. Claim Objection

Applicants have made a purely cosmetic amendment to claim 14 to overcome the informality noted.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 14.

3. Rejections under 35 USC § 102(e)

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0067854 A1 by Reintjes, et al. ("Reintjes '854").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 and the rejection is moot.

Regarding claims 1 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that Reintjes '854 does not teach or suggest:

capturing user stroke data from a form including strokes made by a user with a pointing device by tracing over at least one form identifier character that is pre-printed on the form.

Furthermore, regarding claims 3 and 11, Applicants respectfully submit that Reintjes '854 does not teach or suggest:

Serial No.: 10/065,285
Attorney Docket No.: F-560

Patent

processing a pre-determined portion of the stroke data corresponding to at least one control string character to determine the form identification data; and receiving user pen stroke data from at least one data field of the form before processing the strokes in order to determine the form identification data.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1-4, 6, and 9-12.

4. Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0067854 A1 by Reintjes, et al. ("Reintjes '854") in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,273,123 to Lowitz ("Lowitz '123).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 and the rejection is moot. The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons referred to above with reference to the associated independent claim.

Furthermore, the references are not properly combined. Lowitz '123 does not discuss form recognition, but merely describes character recognition. Furthermore, Reintjes does not describe any need for character recognition because input in the form region is considered, not the particular characters being input. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, there would no need to know what characters were being written. The only possible reason on this record to add character recognition to Reintjes '854 to "more accurately identify the form" as stated by the Examiner is by using improper hindsight and improperly using the teachings of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 5 and 13.

Serial No.: 10/065,285
Attorney Docket No.: F-560

Patent

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7-8 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0067854 A1 by Reintjes, et al. ("Reintjes '854") in view of U.S. Patent No. 1,684,756 to Close ("Close '756").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 and the rejection is moot. The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons referred to above with reference to the associated independent claim.

Furthermore, the references are not properly combined. Reintjes does not describe any need for a form serial number because input in the form region is considered, not the particular characters being input. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, there would no need to know what characters were being written. The only possible reason on this record to add character recognition to Reintjes '854 to "more accurately identify the form" as stated by the Examiner is by using improper hindsight and improperly using the teachings of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 7-8 and 14-15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and submit that the invention as presently claimed in claims 1-15 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

5. Conclusion Of Remarks

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

Serial No.: 10/065,285
Attorney Docket No.: F-560

Patent

6. Authorization

No fee is believed due with this Amendment other than that associated with the enclosed petition for extension of time to respond. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-560.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-560.

Respectfully submitted,



George M. Macdonald
Reg. No. 39,284
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3180

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000